



**UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/988,836	11/19/2001	Thomas M. Sirhall	SMQ-062	9387
959	7590	10/27/2004	EXAMINER	
LAHIVE & COCKFIELD, LLP. 28 STATE STREET BOSTON, MA 02109			HUTTON JR, WILLIAM D	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2179		

DATE MAILED: 10/27/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/988,836	SIRHALL, THOMAS M.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Doug Hutton	2179	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 November 2001.

2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 19 November 2001 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.

3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

<p>1)<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)</p> <p>2)<input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)</p> <p>3)<input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.</p>	<p>4)<input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.</p> <p>5)<input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)</p> <p>6)<input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.</p>
---	---

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Claim Objections***

Claims 1, 9 and 13 are objected to because of the following informalities:

- the phrases “a party” in Claim 1, Line 6 and “the party” in Claim 1, Line 7 should be amended to — the user — because the “party” referred to is actually the “user” that is previously recited (see Claim 1, Line 4); Claims 9 and 13 have the same problem.

Claims 7 and 19 are objected to because of the following informalities:

- the phrase “the cursor” in Claim 7, Line 6 should be amended to — a cursor — because no cursor is previously mentioned in the claims; Claim 19 has the same problem.

Claim 14 is objected to because of the following informalities:

- the term “documents” in Line 2 has no antecedent basis and should be amended.

Claim 15 is objected to because of the following informalities:

- the term “markup language” in Lines 1-2 has no antecedent basis and should be amended.

Appropriate correction is required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rukavina et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2002/0188583, in view of Carroll, U.S. Patent No. 6,762,777.

*Claim 1:*

Rukavina discloses, in an electronic device in a distributed network, a method practiced by an online educational facility (see Figures 1 and 3-5; see Page 2, Paragraph 0017 – Rukavina discloses this limitation, as clearly indicated in the cited figures and text), comprising the steps of:

- providing a web page with an embedded software facility as part of an online educational course, wherein said software facility displays text to a user (see Figures 3-5; see Page 4, Paragraph 0044 through Page 5, Paragraph 0053 – Rukavina discloses this limitation, as clearly indicated in the cited figures and text);
- receiving a request for the web page from a party (see Page 2, Paragraph 0017 – Rukavina discloses this limitation, as clearly indicated in the cited text); and

- transmitting the web page to the party in response to the request (see Figures 3-5; see Page 2, Paragraph 0017 – Rukavina discloses this limitation, as clearly indicated in the cited figures and text).

Rukavina fails to expressly disclose a software facility that enables a user to create a popup message associated with the text that is displayed to the user.

Carroll teaches in an electronic device in a distributed network, a method, comprising the step of:

- providing a web page with an embedded software facility, wherein said software facility enables a user to create a popup message associated with text that is to be displayed to the user (see Figure 1; see Column 3, Lines 5-11 – Carroll discloses this limitation in that, when the user moves his cursor over the highlighted region of electronic text, a popup window appears),

for the purpose of adding comments or expanding a description of a particular section of the web page (see Column 1, Lines 22-29).

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method, disclosed in Rukavina, to include:

- providing a web page with an embedded software facility, wherein said software facility enables a user to create a popup message associated with text that is to be displayed to the user,

for the purpose of adding comments or expanding a description of a particular section of the web page, as taught by Carroll.

*Claim 2:*

Rukavina discloses a software facility that is an applet (see Page 3, Paragraphs 0035-0036 – Rukavina discloses this limitation in that the e-learning tool includes learning objects in an object-oriented environment).

*Claim 3:*

Rukavina discloses a web page that is an HTML document (see Page 1, Paragraph 0007 – Rukavina discloses this limitation, as clearly indicated in the cited text).

*Claim 4:*

Rukavina discloses a web page that is an XML document (see Page 1, Paragraph 0008 – Rukavina discloses this limitation, as clearly indicated in the cited text).

*Claim 5:*

Rukavina discloses a software facility that is automatically executed after being transmitted to the client (see Figure 1; see Page 3, Paragraph 0030 – Rukavina discloses this limitation in that the e-learning tool includes a dynamic delivery tool that

delivers content to the user and monitors the user's interactions with the web page in order to respond to subsequent requests by the user).

*Claim 6:*

Rukavina discloses a software facility that executes in a web browser environment (see Figures 1 and 7; see Page 6, Paragraph 0063 – Rukavina discloses this limitation, as clearly indicated in the cited figures and text).

*Claim 7:*

Rukavina discloses a software facility that performs the following step when the software facility executes:

- receiving the text (see Figures 3-5; see Page 2, Paragraph 0017 – Rukavina discloses this limitation, as clearly indicated in the cited figures and text).

Rukavina fails to expressly disclose:

- defining at least one outlined area in the text where the popup message will appear; and
- tracking movement of the cursor and displaying the popup message when the cursor enters the at least one outlined area.

Carroll teaches a software facility that performs the following step when the software facility executes:

- defining at least one outlined area in the text where the popup message will appear (see Figure 1; see Column 3, Lines 5-11 – Carroll discloses this limitation in that the text display system includes a highlighted region of electronic text); and
- tracking movement of the cursor and displaying the popup message when the cursor enters the at least one outlined area (see Figure 1; see Column 3, Lines 5-11 – Carroll discloses this limitation in that the text display system displays the popup window when the cursor is in the highlighted region, and, when the cursor moves outside the highlighted region, the popup window disappears),

for the purpose of adding comments or expanding a description of a particular section of the web page (see Column 1, Lines 22-29).

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method, disclosed in Rukavina, to include:

- defining at least one outlined area in the text where the popup message will appear; and
- tracking movement of the cursor and displaying the popup message when the cursor enters the at least one outlined area,

for the purpose of adding comments or expanding a description of a particular section of the web page, as taught by Carroll.

*Claim 8:*

Rukavina discloses text that is sections of computer programming code (see Figure 3; see Page 4, Paragraph 0044 – Rukavina discloses this limitation in that the e-learning tool displays an online course on Java programming language).

*Claims 9-12:*

Claims 9-12 merely recite computer software that performs the methods of Claims 1-4, respectively. Thus, Claims 9-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rukavina, in view of Carroll, using the same rationale indicated in the above rejections for Claims 1-4.

*Claims 13, 14 and 16-20:*

Claims 13, 14 and 16-20 merely recite a computer that performs the methods of Claims 1, 3, 2 and 5-8, respectively. Thus, Claims 13, 14 and 16-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rukavina, in view of Carroll, using the same rationale indicated in the above rejections for Claims 1, 3, 2 and 5-8.

*Claim 15:*

Rukavina discloses markup language that includes executable content for viewing images (see Figure 5; see Page 5, Paragraph 0051 – Rukavina discloses this limitation, as clearly indicated in the cited figure and text).

***Conclusion***

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure: Carroll, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2003/0160807; Matous et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2002/0188679; Eisendrath et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,347,333; Schwartz, U.S. Patent No. 6,705,869; LoSasso et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,755,659; and Dattaray et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2003/0073063.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Doug Hutton whose telephone number is (571) 272-4137. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:00 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon, can be reached at (571) 272-4136. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-2100.

WDH  
October 26, 2004



**DOUG HUTTON**  
**PATENT EXAMINER**  
**TECH CENTER 2100**